

<h2 style="margin: 0;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</h2>		<b>Application No.</b> 10/576,721	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SEINO ET AL.		
		<b>Examiner</b> HENG CHAN		<b>Art Unit</b> 1728	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) HENG CHAN.

(2) Soonwuk Cheong.

**Date of Interview:** 1 June 2011

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 2pm

  

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

  

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

  

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  

/HENG M CHAN/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1728

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed claim amendments in a fax including amending the language of claim 1 and the claimed range of LMAB so that it did not include 0%. The Examiner also suggested making the product claims including claim 4 depend on the process claim 1 so that the process limitations would result in structural differences in the product. Applicants accepted amendments to claim 1, but not claim 4..